

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, 12, 18, 20, 24, 28-29, 37-38, 41-42, 45-46 and 48 are amended. Claims 2, 13-17, 19, 30-36, 39-40 and 43 were previously canceled. Hence, Claims 1, 3-12, 18, 20-29, 37-38, 41-42 and 44-48 are pending.

I. ISSUES NOT RELATING TO PRIOR ART

A. CLAIMS 18, 20-29, 41, 42 AND 46-48 -- 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 18, 20-29, 41, 42 and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. (Office Action, page 5) Applicants believe that the rejection is fully addressed in amended Claim 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS 1, 2, 4-12, 18, 21-29, 37, 38, 41, 42 AND 44-48 - 35 U.S.C. § 102: JONES

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 18, 21-29, 37, 38, 41, 42 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Jones et al., WIPO Publication No. WO 03/030483 ("Jones"). (Office Action: page 6) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIM 1

Among other features, present Claim 1 recites:

said first AAA server sending, to the first network device, a Remote Authentication Dial In User Service (RADIUS) protocol access accept message that includes the accounting record [for the client] within the RADIUS access accept message, **causing the accounting record [for the client] to be logged on a second network device, and to be sent by the second network device to a second AAA server within a RADIUS start session message;**

Support for the amendment is provided at least in paragraphs [47]-[54] of the applicants' specification, although Claim 1 is not viewed as limited to those paragraphs.

Claim 1 recites that in response to receiving from a first network device a request to authorize a client to access a network resource, a first AAA server obtains an accounting record for the client from an external resource. For example, in one embodiment of Claim 1, the

external resource is a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) server coupled to the AAA server. (Spec. Para [35]). In Claim 1, the accounting record obtained from the external resource is used by the first AAA server to authorize the client to access the network resource. The first AAA server then sends a RADIUS access-accept message to the first network device. The RADIUS access-accept message includes the accounting record used to authorize the client. The accounting record is subsequently logged on a second network device so that the second network device can send the accounting record within a RADIUS start session message to a second AAA server.

In one embodiment, the approach recited in Claim 1 allows an accounting record for a client obtained from an external resource to be logged by various network devices throughout the network during one AAA session **without having to re-obtain the accounting record from the external resource and without having to cache the accounting record**. This is accomplished in part by a first AAA server sending to a first network device a RADIUS access accept message that includes the accounting record for the client, and causing the accounting record to be logged on a second network device for the second network device to send the accounting record within a RADIUS start session message when the second AAA server needs the accounting record for the client.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Jones because Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not described in Jones. For example, Jones does not describe sending, by a first AAA server to a first network device, a RADIUS access accept message that includes an accounting record for a client within the access accept message, and causing the accounting record to be logged on a second network device and to be sent by the second network device to a second AAA server within a RADIUS start session message, as claimed.

**Jones' server does not cause an accounting record for a client to be logged on a second network device and to be sent by the second network device to another server within a RADIUS start session message**, as claimed. On page 10 (ll. 23-35), Jones describes that a RADIUS server generates an access-accept message and sends it to a PDSN element service a client. The PDSN element receives the access-accept message, initializes a data service for the service-requesting client, and sends an accounting-start message to the RADIUS server. The accounting-start message contains a session-Id attribute, which is used by the RADIUS server to track the data session for the client. (Jones: page 10, ll. 30-35) However, Jones' server does not cause any accounting record for the client to be sent to another AAA server, as claimed. Further, Jones' server does not cause the accounting record to be logged on a second network device so that the second network device can send the accounting record for the client to another AAA server within a RADIUS start session message, as claimed. Jones' start message contains a session-Id, which is generated by the network device, not sent to the network device by a first AAA server within an access accept message, as claimed, and forwarded to another AAA server in a start-session message, as claimed.

**Jones' AAA server does not cause the accounting record to be sent to another AAA server**, as claimed. On page 7 (ll. 10-15) and in FIGS. 2 and 5, Jones describes sending a state session key with each message that a mobile node transmits during its active session. In Jones, when an AAA server receives a request to authorize a data session for a mobile node, the AAA server checks whether the mobile node is already present in a session state store, and if so, the AAA server retrieves, from an external source, a session key assigned to the mobile node previous session. Hence, in Jones, each AAA server has to retrieve the session key (and other accounting information) from external source each time the accounting information is needed. In Jones, the accounting record for a client is obtained from an external resource, not sent to another AAA server in a start-session message when the AAA server requires the accounting record for the client, as claimed. Jones does not log the accounting record on a second network device to be sent to another AAA server, as claimed.

Therefore, Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not anticipated by Jones. Hence, Claim 1 is patentable over Jones. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIM 18

Claim 18 recites features that are similar to those of independent Claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Claim 18 is allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

#### C. CLAIMS 3 AND 20 - 35 U.S.C. § 103: JONES, WANG

Claims 3 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Jones in view of Wang et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0035409 (“Wang”). (Office Action: page 10) This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, and Claim 20 depends from Claim 18. As discussed above, each of Claims 1 and 18 is patentable over Jones. Wang does not cure the deficiencies of Jones with respect to Claims 1 and 18. Therefore, and due to claim dependency, each of Claims 3 and 20 is patentable over Jones and Wang, individually or in combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The claims that are not discussed above depend directly or indirectly on the claims that have been discussed. Therefore, those claims are patentable for the reasons given above. In addition, each of the dependent claims separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

#### II. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A petition for an extension of time is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to

charge any applicable fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: August 9, 2010

/MalgorzataAKulczycka#50496/  
Malgorzata A. Kulczycka  
Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110-1089  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1228  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076